House Resolution 25

*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alabama:*

1. That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alabama hereby lends its endorsement to House Resolution 7848, introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, California, which calls for a sweeping overhaul of the public assistance section of the Federal Social Security Act, the making available of additional Federal funds for public assistance purposes, and the requirement of uniformity in the public assistance laws of the 48 States by the establishment of a single standard of qualifications for the applicants and recipients of such assistance.

2. That the house of representatives of the legislature also endorses House Resolution 7225, introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress by Representative JERE COOPER, Democrat, Tennessee, and sponsored by the majority of the House Ways and Means Committee, which calls for payment of disability benefits to workers at age 50 and to disabled children over 18; the lowering of the eligibility age for widows, wives, and women workers from 65 to 62; and extension of the coverage the Federal Social Security Act to include certan classes of professional people. This will bring millions of Federal money to Alabama for the widows, children, handicapped, and the aged which they would not get otherwise if 7848 and 7225

3. That the clerk of the house of representatives transmit duly authenticated copies of the resolution to each of the following: George McLain, chairman of the old folks lobby, Hotel Congressional, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington 3, D. C.; Representative James Roosevelt; Representative Jere Cooper; each member of the Alabama delegation in the United States Congress; the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives; the Secretary of the United States Senate; and the Honorable James E. Folsom, Governor of the State of Alabama; and that the clerk of the house also transmit a copy of this resolution to the members of the press, and cause a copy to be spread on the Journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alabama.

Adopted by the house of representatives February 7, 1956.

---

(Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. SIEMINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

---

## THE GAS BILL AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include certain newspaper articles.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Democratic State Central Committee, controlled by the UAW-CIO, in a release dated February 7, charges Michigan Republicans who voted for the gas bill with accepting campaign contributions from the gas interests and adds that it "intends to make a major campaign issue against the 6 Republican Congressmen." The committee finds no fault with the Democratic leaders of the House and Senate, both of whom supported the bill, nor with the 22 Democratic Senators who voted for it.

Condemning Republicans, condoning Democrats who cast the same vote, shows the committee has no political principles. They falsely charge that Republicans who voted for the bill "sold out the people back home." But they say nothing about Democrats who voted the same way. Of course, the truth is that no one sold out anyone.

There is ample room for an honest difference of opinion on the merits of the gas legislation, no necessity for questioning the motives of anyone, but the CIO Democratic State Central Committee cannot resist or refrain from its usual mudslinging policies.

General speaking, those who believe that the power of the Federal Government and of the bureaucrats should be extended, voted against the bill. Those who believe that all powers not expressly delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government should be retained by the States and the people of the States, voted for it.

Always I have voted against extension of the power of the Federal Government, against measures designed to limit the rights of the people or of the States.

The charge that the passage of the bill would increase, its defeat lessen, the price of gas to the consumer is without any foundation whatsoever. The price of gas to the consumer is regulated by the States—in Michigan by the Public Service Commission.

The transportation of the gas from the well to the distributor, because it is interstate business, is regulated by the Federal Government.

The so-called gas bill provides that the Federal Government shall not control the production of gas at the well.

There is no more reason why the Federal Government should control the price or production of gas at the well than it should control the local gas-making plant, the production and the price of oil or coal, the amount of dues collected by the local union or the chamber of commerce.

If the driller for natural gas is lucky and makes a profit, don't worry, the tax collector, local, State, and Federal, will visit him.

To the CIO's Democratic State Central Committee's inquiry as to whether certain Congressmen accepted or intended to accept contributions from the oil and gas interests, my answer is—as the CIO should well know—that I never have gotten, and I never expect to get, any.

No part of the $1,035,958 spent in 1954 by labor organizations in political activities came to me. Nor was a dollar of the $272,714 political fund of the UAW-CIO-PAC spent in my behalf.

The sworn statements of the CIO, on file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, shows that over the years the CIO has, as it did last year, made political contributions to my political opponent. Undoubtedly, the reason was that they expected he would be their rubber stamp, their yes man, vote for their legislative program here in Washington.

Why do not the CIO, the PAC, the AFL, Railway Labor's Political League, Labor's Political League, and other labor organizations which make campaign contributions, publicize the payments which they make to political candidates, some of them exceeding $30,000 to one candidate.

The current press carries the statement that the political bigwigs of the AFL–CIO, meeting at Miami Beach, are contemplating spending some $2 million to defeat Congressmen who do not bow to their will. Looks as though the labor bosses, with their campaign millions, have Congressional candidates who will not kiss the collective labor "foot," over a barrel.

Apparently, the CIO intends to continue to use funds paid in by its members—even though they are Republicans—to support its hand-picked candidates running under a Democratic label. This money to be used for political candidates and purposes, according to the union announcements, comes "from two sources, voluntary contributions from union members and from union treasuries."

Of course union members have the right to contribute to campaign funds but unions do not have the right to use dues or special assessments to make campaign contributions unless they are voluntarily paid in for that purpose.

While the Michigan CIO called for defeat of Republicans who voted for the gas bill, will it support the Republican Members of the House and the Senate who voted against it? It sure will not.

The foregoing is proof, if any was needed, that there is no real Democratic Party in Michigan. It is but the mouthpiece of the UAW–CIO, of those labor leaders who would establish an over-all labor government at Washington. Do you want Congressmen who are UAW–CIO Democratic stooges?

---

## TRANSFER OF CERTAIN SPECIAL ORDERS FROM WEDNESDAY TO THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I understand there are some special orders that have been entered for tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that the Members having such special orders for tomorrow may, if they desire, have them transferred to Thursday, and that they be first in order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that puts them ahead of all the rest of the Members who obtained special orders for Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is wrong with that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was on last week, and because the House adjourned over, I did not have my special order transferred.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts, had he thought of it, would have attempted to protect the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, with that, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## THE CYPRUS ISSUE

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a clear-cut, objective editorial, in which I am in agreement, entitled "The Cyprus Issue Should Be a Test Case for the Moral Basis of United States Diplomacy," appearing in the February 13, 1956, issue of Life magazine.

As the author of the resolution against colonialism and Communist imperialism, which was unanimously passed, last year, by both branches of the Congress, I hope the people of Greece and of Cyprus will realize that the American people are their friends, and that the overwhelming feeling of the people of the United States is strongly favorable to the aspirations of the people of Cyprus. The people of Greece and Cyprus should not overlook this important fact.

This strong public opinion existing in the United States in favor of Cyprus and the aspirations of the great majority of its people, is having considerable influence in our present Government, which influence is rapidly increasing in favor of the position of Cyprus and of Greece and of their people.

As a matter of fact, public opinion in America is being aroused against the unwise and untenable position that the present Government has placed the United States in in the minds of many millions of persons—of directly or indirectly supporting colonialism. This position is as far removed from the minds of the American people as anything can be.

The people of Greece and of Cyprus can depend on the overwhelming opinion of the American people in support of their position.

In my opinion, the question of Cyprus is bound to be settled in a satisfactory manner, and in the near future.

No matter how keenly disappointed the people of Greece and Cyprus are at the present time, I hope they will not lose sight of the real, lasting view, the strong friendship between them and the people of the United States.

[From Life magazine of February 13, 1956]

THE CYPRUS ISSUE SHOULD BE A TEST CASE FOR THE MORAL BASIS OF UNITED STATES DIPLOMACY

"Of course we do not always agree at every point," said the British Prime Minister to the United States Senate last week, "but it is the strength of our unity that we have no need to conceal this." Amen. The points of disagreement—East-West trade, Quemoy-Matsu, etc.—can be lived with when they are mutually recognized. It is when they are too long ignored that they make trouble.

That, we fear, is what has happened to the question of Cyprus. The status of this pretty island, a crown colony of 500,000 British subjects, has been more or less correctly regarded as one of Britain's internal problems. But Britain's continuing failure to solve it is by now not only involving United States prestige throughout the eastern Mediterranean, but endangering NATO's whole southern front.

What makes Cyprus urgent is that the Greeks are having an election this month (February 19). Twice in the past 12 years Greece has been rescued from communism only by civil war—in 1944 with British help, in 1947–49 with American (under General Van Fleet). The nation whose ancestors invented democracy is now in danger of an unintentional surrender to communism via the ballot box.

The present Greek Premier, Constantin Karamanlis, is one of the most promising young politicos the non-Communist world has produced since the Philippines produced Magsaysay. Karamanlis is a fresh new face in a country weary of its own aging political hacks and opportunists. But the latter have formed a strong coalition, which includes the Communists, in their effort to defeat him. If they win, Greek foreign policy could be expected to shift from NATO to neutralism.

Unfortunately Karamanlis' pro-Western sentiments are a political liability to him in Greece today, while the opportunists see their opportunity in the fact that "popular-front" communism is becoming almost respectable again—only 6 short years after civil war. That is the measure of how fast and how far Western prestige has tumbled in Greece. The reasons for the tumble are various, but the operative one is Cyprus.

The Cypriots, 80 percent of whom are ethnically Greek, ask their British rulers for a promise of self-determination at some definite date, with an ultimate view to enosis (reunion) with Greece. Their leader is the bland and capable "ethnarch," Archbishop Makarios. Their opponents are the Turkish minority on the island, the Government of nearby Turkey (see map), and the British, to whom Cyprus is chiefly important as the site of their huge new eastern Mediterranean air and naval base.

British diplomacy gave Makarios a big boost by at first refusing to discuss self-determination or enosis at all. This led to a wave of underground terrorism and open resistance on Cyprus which has so far cost 15 British dead, hundreds wounded on both sides and scores jailed under martial law. The British have even threatened to break all British precedent by jamming Cyprus' radio reception. Their negotiators meanwhile have engaged in a slow, dithering retreat before Makarios' demands, each step of which has been too little and too late to win them any credit for either sincerity or imagination.

Greek (no less than Cypriot) sentiment is overwhelmingly pro-Makarios. The archbishop could probably swing the Greek election if he were to denounce either party as "soft" (i. e., pro-British) on the Cyprus issue. It is the issue in Grece today—not a social or economic issue, but a foreign policy issue. And it gets its heat from the fact that it is also a moral issue—involving the right of Europe's largest remaining European colony to self-determination.

The principle of self-determination is Wilsonian. The moral basis of foreign policy is an Eisenhower-Dulles specialty. What then has the United States done about Cyprus? It has backed the British at all critical points in the negotiations, and otherwise stood aloof, not wanting to alienate Turkey. As a result the United States shares the opprobrium of British policy in Greece today.

To appreciate Greek feelings, suppose Chinese Communist MIG's shot down several United States passenger planes over the China Sea—and the Indian Government addressed identical notes to Red China and the United States urging both sides to cut out this rowdyism. We would regard such a note as a vulgar impertinence. That is how the Greeks felt last fall when, after Turkish mobs had burned and pillaged the Greek section of Istanbul, Secretary Dulles sent identical notes of reproof to Greece and Turkey. When Greeks hear United States foreign policy described as "moral," they want to throw up.

Diplomacy is a dangerous and complex art at best; and when it takes morality for its guide, it adds a complication without subtracting any. Moral principle is nevertheless the only possible guide for an American foreign policy. Anticommunism is also difficult and dangerous enough without the complicating problem of how and how fast the West should liquidate the remnants of its own colonialism. The Communists can exploit this liquidation whether it goes slow or fast. In the Cyprus issue the Communists are pressing Makarios from one side and Karamanlis from the other. These two natural allies of the West are prevented from acting as such because Cyprus is still denied self-determination. The preelection atmosphere in Greece has become a frantic one in which such hard words as treason and betrayal are becoming commonplace.

The obstacles to self-determination for Cyprus are real but not insuperable. The British base could become a NATO base, and the Turkish minority could be assured constitutional protection. Let us hope the British-Cypriot negotiations have reached their long-delayed agreement before these words see print. It would be tragic if further delay should cost the West, through the defeat of Karamanlis, the NATO ally first singled out and preserved by the Truman doctrine. In private, the State Department is for self-determination. The time has come to make it known that we are for it, within the free world as well as without. The time has come for Americans to let Greeks know that we have not lost interest in their fortunes nor our willingness to take their side.

Said the Eden-Eisenhower declaration of Washington last week, "We uphold the basic right of peoples to governments of their own choice." The time has come to implement this Anglo-American principle in Cyprus. A principled foreign policy is the hardest kind to achieve, but the kind whose solutions last the longest.

## UNIFORM APPEALS RIGHTS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include two letters.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this session of Congress I introduced a bill in the House to provide for uniform appeals and grievance procedures in the Federal Government. The bill is numbered H. R. 8002, and it affects approximately one-half of all Federal employees. I would like to speak today about this legislation, explain its purposes, and answer the report submitted on this measure by the Comptroller General of the United States.

THE NEED FOR REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

Under the laws which are presently in effect, roughly one-half of Federal employees have no statutory right to ask for a hearing—or to appeal—any adverse personnel action. They can be fired, suspended, furloughed without compensation, downgraded, or debarred from future employment without being given a chance to defend themselves at a hearing, or through an appeal. The only

thing which the law provides for them is a right to advance notice of removal or suspension.

Further, our laws do not establish any uniform grievance procedures for 50 percent of Federal workers. There is no statutory provision which would entitle them to fair treatment in matters involving complaints about working conditions, reassignments, letters of reprimand, short suspensions, or nonselection for promotion.

The Congress has established appeals and grievance procedure for veterans employed by the National Government, but it has failed to provide equal justice under the law for the other half of Federal employees.

This state of affairs is neither fair nor conducive to harmony and efficiency in Federal Government. The executive branch has tried to remedy the situation through a maze of administrative regulations and directives. On the strength of such directives, a sadly deficient patchwork of appeals and grievance procedures has been established within some executive departments and agencies. These procedures lack uniformity and strength which come from statutory rights. They are incapable of assuring equal and fair treatment to all Federal workers.

CONDITIONS CRITICIZED BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The conditions which I have described briefly have been in existence for quite some time. They have been investigated and criticized as recently as 1953 and 1954 by two separate congressional committees. Unfortunately, little has been done to remedy them, and, until the introduction of H. R. 8002, there was no legislation pending which would bring fairness and uniformity to the appeals and grievance policies and practices of the Federal Government.

THE PROVISIONS OF H. R. 8002

The bill which I have introduced, H. R. 8002, proposes to remedy this situation. It is based on the findings and recommendations of duly constituted congressional committees which have investigated the deficiencies existing in this particular area. Further—and this is a point which I made clear at the time when I introduced H. R. 8002—my bill will in no way impair, jeopardize, or otherwise affect the rights extended by law to the one-half of Federal employees who are veterans.

In general, H. R. 8002 is intended to accomplish the following objectives:

First. To provide uniform appeals machinery for all Federal employees.

Second. To establish broad standards for the introduction of generally uniform grievance procedures.

Third. To encourage better training of supervisory personnel to solve grievances promptly, if possible on the local level, and with the help of employee representatives.

Fourth. To direct the Civil Service Commission to assume jurisdiction over substantive issues in appeals. The Commission up to now has been restricting itself to the consideration of mere procedural issues. It is maintained that the Commission cannot properly discharge its responsibilities for the well-being of Government employees by dodging substantive issues.

THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT

H. R. 8002 was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and a report thereon was promptly requested from the appropriate executive agency. On January 31, I received a communication from the Honorable TOM MURRAY, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, in which Chairman MURRAY transmitted a copy of the report submitted on H. R. 8002 by the Comptroller General of the United States.

I would like to include that report in the RECORD. It read as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, D. C., January 25, 1956.*

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letters of January 6 and 9, 1956, acknowledged January 9 and 11, request our views on H. R. 8002 and H. R. 8147, respectively. The stated purpose of the two bills—which are identical—is to provide a more equitable system for the settlement of disputes arising from personnel actions in the classified civil service, and of grievances and complaints of all Government personnel, and for other purposes.

One of the main features of the bill is to extend to nonveteran Government employees the same rights of procedure and appeal concerning removals, suspensions from duty for more than 30 days, and reductions in rank or compensation which are now granted to veterans under section 14 of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended (5 U. S. C. 863).

The removal and suspension from the service of nonveteran employees in the classified civil service for reasons other than security and reductions in force are now governed by section 6 (a) of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the act of June 10, 1948 (5 U. S. C. 652), as follows:

"(a) No person in the classified civil service of the United States shall be removed or suspended without pay therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of such service and for reasons given in writing. Any person whose removal or suspension without pay is sought shall (1) have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him; (2) be furnished with a copy of such charges; (3) be allowed a reasonable time for filing a written answer to such charges, with affidavits; and (4) be furnished at the earliest practicable date with a written decision on such answer. No examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer or employee directing the removal or suspension without pay. Copies of the charges, the notice of hearing, the answer, the reasons for removal or suspension without pay, and the order of removal or suspension without pay shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or agency, as shall also the reasons for reduction in grade or compensation; and copies of the same shall be furnished, upon request, to the person affected and to the Civil Service Commission. This subsection shall apply to a person within the purview of section 863 of this title, only if he so elects."

Under the above-quoted provisions of law an employee in the classified civil service prior to removal or suspension from the service is insured of his being informed of the charges against him, with an opportunity to answer within a reasonable time and to have such answer considered by administrative officials in the form of a written decision thereon. While the act does not give an employee the right to appeal the decision of the agency to the Civil Service Commission, the regulations of the latter agency (section 9.106) do provide that an employee may, within 10 days after the effective date of a separation, demotion, reassignment, or suspension, request the Commission to investigate whether the procedures in the above act, as amplified by the Commission's regulations (section 9.102) have been followed. However, the Commission has no authority to pass upon the sufficiency of the reasons which form the basis of the action by the administrative office.

As opposed to the benefits accorded to civil-service employees (nonveterans) those employees coming within the purview of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, are entitled to 30 days' advance written notice of any proposed removal, suspension for more than 30 days, furlough, or reduction in rank or compensation, and to an appeal to the Civil Service Commission either on the merits or the procedural aspects of a particular case.

We do not believe the employment rights of nonveteran employees in the classified civil service have been appreciably affected by the denial of 30 days' advance notice of any adverse personnel action or the right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission on the substantive features thereof. On the contrary, our view is that the employment rights of classified civil service employees (nonveterans) are amply protected by the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission.

If the proposed legislation here involved be enacted it would further limit the authority of the head of an agency in the removal of inefficient and undesirable personnel and would subject his judgment to reversal by the Civil Service Commission, a situation which is not conducive to sound personnel administration.

While the argument that all classes of Federal personnel should be accorded the same employment rights is not without merit, we would favor the limitation of veterans rights to accomplish that purpose rather than increasing the employment rights of nonveteran employees. This could be accomplished along the lines of the recommendation of the Hoover Commission which is contained in its report to the Congress (Personnel and Civil Service), dated February 1955, pages 67 to 75.

Undoubtedly, the cost to the Government would be increased in the event of further extension of appeal rights to nonveteran civil service employees, since there not only would be an increase in the number of appeals handled by the Civil Service Commission but also an increase in litigation in the Court of Claims and the United States District Courts.

We would have no objection to standardization and consolidation of existing appeals and grievance procedures where feasible throughout the Government service. However, we would like to reserve any comments as to how this best could be accomplished until such time as these matters might be made the subject of a separate bill.

Referring again to the extension of appeal rights to nonveteran employees, we suggest for consideration, in the event the committee determined to report favorably on the bill or bills, an amendment of section 14 of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, to accomplish such purpose, rather than by the method proposed in the two bills.

Because of the foregoing comments we recommend against enactment of H. R. 8002 and H. R. 8147.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

Needless to say, the Comptroller General's report disturbed me greatly. The report implied that the conditions prevailing in the field of Federal appeals and grievance procedures are satisfactory—whereas congressional investigations produced entirely different reports. In the past several weeks, I received numerous letters from Federal employees in many different parts of our Nation, which have strengthened my opinion about the inadequacy of the existing procedures and policies, and which are at variance with the views expounded by the Comptroller General.

A REPLY TO THE REPORT

Neither can I agree with some of the other issues raised by the Comptroller General in his report. For that reason, I have written to Chairman TOM MURRAY, of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, expressing my strenuous objections to the report rendered on H. R. 8002 by Mr. Campbell. I should like to read my letter for inclusion in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., February 13, 1956.*

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MURRAY: Thank you for sending me a copy of the report rendered by the Comptroller General of the United States on H. R. 8002, the bill which I introduced to provide uniform appeals and grievance procedures for our Federal employees.

In his report, the Comptroller General expressed the opinion that "the employment rights of classified civil-service employees (nonveterans) are amply protected by the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission;"

That the proposal outlined in H. R. 8002 "is not conducive to sound personnel administration" because it would limit the removal authority of administrative officials;

That the proposal may be objectionable from the standpoint of economy, for the extension of appeal rights to nonveterans in the civil service would cost the Government some money.

Finally, the Comptroller General suggests that, if Congress wishes to equalize appeals rights of classified workers, it should limit the rights of veterans to accomplish this purpose—rather than increase the employment rights of nonveterans.

I wish to express my strenuous objection to each of the four points raised by the Comptroller General in rendering his report on H. R. 8002.

I believe that the proposal outlined in H. R. 8002 is badly needed. I have received numerous letters from Government employees all over the country attesting to this fact. Books and articles have been written on the subject, supporting this view. I shall not, however, resort to such support for my proposal. Instead, I shall call upon the findings of two separate congressional investigations, which reviewed this matter thoroughly, and on whose specific recommendations H. R. 8002 was based.

I am referring to House Report No. 1759, 83d Congress, 2d session, and to Senate Document No. 33, 83d Congress, 1st session. Both reports dealt with appeals and grievance procedures in the Federal Government. They recommended the enactment of remedial legislation to provide an equitable system for the settlement of disputes arising from personnel actions in the classified civil service, and of grievances of all Government personnel.

With regard to the first two points raised by the Comptroller General, as listed in the second paragraph of this letter, I would like to quote from the findings of House Report No. 1759, 83d Congress. The report stated, in part, that:

"The executive branch of the Government is without adequate machinery to guarantee equal and fair treatment to all Federal employees in respect to appeals from adverse personnel actions.

"This situation creates an ideal climate for bias and injustice which is repugnant to our native sense of fair play. A failure of positive assurance against arbitrary and capricious acts by management in our Federal Government constitutes a real weakness in the system of justice that all English-speaking peoples have built up over many centuries * * * there is no justification for continuance of the present situation which in effect relegates our nonpreference Federal employees to the status of second-class citizens, in comparison with others, in certain classes of appeals from adverse personnel actions."

And, further, with reference to grievance procedures:

"Grievance machinery in the executive branch, if properly used, would be adequate and some agencies are making effective use thereof. However, it is not being applied with any degree of uniformity and in a number of agencies its full potential is being wasted."

I would also like to refer to the Senate document cited above which, on pages 3–5, decried the fact that "appeals and grievances policies and practices in the Federal Government as a whole are in a state of confusion;" that they are based upon a "patchwork" of laws and executive regulations; that they lack uniformity and consistency, and are often couched in vague, and ambiguous terms; and that the existing conditions have tended "to breed confusion and misunderstanding and to cause resentment, distrust, and exasperation on the part of employees and management alike."

These are not empty words. They have been carefully weighed by responsible congressional committees which have investigated existing conditions. Perhaps the Comptroller General ought to become acquainted with those reports, before dismissing the remedies proposed as being unnecessary.

The third point raised by the Comptroller General in his report on H. R. 8002 should have no bearing on the issue at hand. There is no room for pecuniary considerations when one attempts to correct an injustice. I do not believe that the Federal Government should deny fair treatment to some of its employees in the field of appeals and grievance procedures for the sake of saving money. This is no field for pennypinching.

As to the Comptroller General's suggestion that veterans' rights in Federal employment be curtailed, I personally do not believe that you can cure the existing shortcomings in that manner. The employment rights granted to veterans by Congress may be reviewed by Congress. Until such action is taken, however, it behooves the executive branch and all concerned to work within the principles established by our national legislature, and to provide equitable conditions within such a framework.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope that your committee will give early consideration to this matter, and initiate a thorough study of the deplorable conditions prevailing in the area of Federal appeals, grievance procedures and policies. I am confident that such a study will demonstrate—beyond any shadow of doubt—the urgent necessity of enacting remedial legislation along the lines suggested in H. R. 8002.

With best wishes, I am,
Yours sincerely,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
*Member of Congress.*

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to reiterate my belief that remedial legislation, providing for uniform and equitable appeals and grievance procedures in the Federal Government, is badly needed.

I believe that the Federal Government must be fair in the treatment of its employees. We should not perpetuate inequalities for the sake of saving some money. Neither do I believe that we should attempt to equalize appeals and grievance procedures by withdrawing from the veterans the rights which have been extended to them in this area.

Such action on our part would constitute a step backward in the field of personnel relations, and further depress the morale of our Federal employees. I would rather see no change than a change for the worse.

The Federal Government should be big enough, and fair enough, to give adequate protection against any possible capricious whims of its officials to all Federal employees.

For these reasons, I sincerely hope that legislative remedy, along the lines proposed in H. R. 8002, will be considered promptly and favorably by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and by the entire House.

## REPEAL OF THE FEDERAL CABARET TAX

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss my reasons for introducing a bill today to repeal the Federal cabaret tax. Although my comments are concerned chiefly with the effect such repeal would have on Michigan, the rest of the country would receive similar benefits.

In order to suggest what effect the repeal of the Federal cabaret tax would be likely to have on the State of Michigan, it is desirable first to set forth some of the facts concerning the tax. The cabaret tax is a Federal tax of 20 percent imposed on amounts paid for admission, refreshment, service—including checkroom service—or merchandise, at any roofgarden, cabaret, or other similar place furnishing a public performance for profit, by or for any patron or guest who is entiled to be present during any portion of such performance.

Prior to World War II, the rate was only 3 percent for the full amount of charges, with an exemption of all charges under $2.50. The present rate has been in effect since 1945, even though the tax rate on other amusements, except for racetracks, was cut from 20 to 10 percent, effective April 1, 1954. The following table gives the total cabaret tax col-